



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,148	01/26/2001	Gary Douglas Huber	M-9876US	7341
27683	7590	01/13/2005	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202			MARTINEZ, DAVID E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2182	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/770,148	Applicant(s) HUBER ET AL.	
	Examiner David E Martinez	Art Unit 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed on 11/16/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 October 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/16/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of US Patent No. 6,038,670 to Oh.

1. With regards to claims 1 and 17, AAPA teaches a mobile computing system comprising of:

a personal computer (PC) system [fig 1];

a personal digital assistant (PDA) system [fig 2] that interfaces to the PC system [page 3 lines 13-20];

a PC chassis [page 3, lines 21-24];

a PDA chassis housing the PDA system [fig 2] wherein the PC chassis hosts the PC system and the PDA chassis, whereby the PDA chassis may be removed from the PC chassis,

Art Unit: 2182

disconnecting an interface of the PDA system [fig 2 element 220] to the PC system, and providing an independent PDA system [figs 1, 2, page 3, lines 3-24]; and

the PDA chassis including:

a memory [fig 2, page 3 lines 3-12],

an independent source of power [fig 2, page 3 lines 3-12];

AAPA teaches all of the above limitations except for the PDA chassis including a processor connected to a system co-processor which controls I/O communications, an I/O device interfacing with the co-processor by means of an I/O bus, an independent source of power connected to the co-processor, a first video bus connecting the PC and the PDA to a common display; and a second video bus connecting a video controller to a PDA display, whereby the second video bus is inactive when the PDA is coupled to the PC.

However, Oh teaches a processor [fig 1 element 11] connected to a system co-processor [fig 1 element 12] which controls I/O communications [column 3 lines 16-25];

an I/O device [fig 1 elements 13, 11, and 14] interfacing with the co-processor [fig 1 element 12] by means of an I/O bus [fig 1, bus lines connecting elements 11, 12, 13, 14];

an independent source of power connected to the co-processor [although not shown on fig 1, there must be an independent source of power to provide the computing elements with energy to operate, see figs 4 and 5, "power supply" elements". In addition, AAPA already supplies an independent source of power as disclosed above];

a first video bus [fig 1, "image signal" bus line] connecting the PC [fig 1 element 16, although is a CRT, PCs are well known in the art to have video in, and thus connecting a portable device to either a CRT or a PC is the same if the particular PC has

Art Unit: 2182

"TV/Video in" feature] and the PDA [fig 1 element 10] to a common display [fig 1 element 16]; and

a second video bus [fig 1 bus line running from element 12 to element 13] connecting a video controller [fig 1 element 12] to a PDA display [fig 1 element 13], whereby the second video bus is inactive when the PDA is coupled to the PC [see abstract] for the benefit of sharing video with an external device while at the same time preventing unnecessary power consumption by the internal display (LCD) of the portable device and thus saving energy and providing extended battery life.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of both AAPA and Oh to provide a processor connected to a system co-processor which controls I/O communications, an I/O device interfacing with the co-processor by means of an I/O bus, an independent source of power connected to the co-processor, a first video bus connecting the PC and the PDA to a common display, and a second video bus connecting a video controller to a PDA display, whereby the second video bus is inactive when the PDA is coupled to the PC for the benefit of sharing video with an external device while at the same time preventing unnecessary power consumption by the internal display (lcd) of the portable device and thus saving energy and providing extended battery life.

2. With regards to claim 2, AAPA teaches the mobile computing system of claim 1 wherein the PDA system is further comprised of:

an input device [fig 2, elements 205, 210, page 3 lines 3-12].

3. With regards to claim 3, AAPA teaches the mobile computing system of claim 2 further comprising: an antenna for wireless communications [fig 2, element 215, page 3 lines 3-12].

Art Unit: 2182

4. With regards to claims 4, 5, and 6, AAPA teaches wherein the PC chassis further comprises one or more expansion bays [fig 1, elements 110, 115], wherein the PDA chassis is placed in one of the bays [page 2 lines 16-21, page 3, lines 13-22].

5. With regards to claims 7, 8, and 9, AAPA teaches wherein the PDA chassis is placed in the interior of the PC chassis [fig 1, elements 110, 115, page 2 lines 16-21, page 3, lines 13-22].

6. With regards to claims 16, AAPA teaches the mobile computing system of claim 1 further comprising: a common display shared by the PC system and the PDA system, and a common set of input output devices shared by the PC system and the PDA system [page 3, lines 13-22].

7. With further regards to claim 17, AAPA teaches a method of integrating a removable PDA system [fig 2] with a PC system [fig 1] comprised of:

connecting the PDA system to the PC system by a separable interface [page 3 lines 3-24];

isolating control to either PDA system or PC system when instructed by a user or a predetermined system logic [page 3, lines 13-22].

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of US Patent No. 6,038,670 to Oh. as applied to claim 1-3 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,768,163 to Smith, II (Smith).

8. With regards to claims 10-15, the combination of AAPA and Oh fail to teach wherein the PDA chassis is placed on the exterior of the PC chassis, and on the top of the PC chassis.

However, Smith teaches the use of a connector for connecting a PDA with a PC chassis [figs 1-7, 10, column 1 line 40 to column 2 line 34] for the benefit increasing the ease of sharing of information between devices.

Art Unit: 2182

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of AAPA, Oh, and Smith to provide the PDA chassis is able to be placed on both the exterior and on top of the PC chassis for the benefit of increasing the ease of sharing of information between devices.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/18/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the previously mailed Final Office Action dated 8/24/04 does not disclose the newly added limitations of amended claims 1 and 17 directed to the PDA chassis.

The current Office Action discloses the newly added limitations directed to the PDA chassis as shown above in the "Claim Rejection" section.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0788077 A1 to Watts, JR. et al.

US Patent No. 6,781,635 to Takeda.

US Patent No. 6,000,000 to Hawkins et al.

US Patent No. 6,523,124 to Lunsford et al.

US Patent No. 6,728,812 to Kato.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E Martinez whose telephone number is (571) 273-4152. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

Art Unit: 2182

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DEM


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER
ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER 2100